New York Tribune

First to Last—The Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements

Member of the Audit Bureau of Circulations

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1918

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York Corporation. Ogden Reid, President; G. Vernor Rogers, Vice-President; F. A. Suter, Treasurer. Address, Tribune Building, 154 Nassau Street, New York. Telephone, Beekman 3000.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York:

IN THE UNITED STATES: OUTSIDE OF GREATER NEW YORK

	1 yr.	6 mo.	3 mo.	1 mo.
Daily and Sunday	$8.50	$4.75	$2.50	$0.85
Daily only	7.00	3.50	1.75	.60
Sunday only	2.50	1.25	.75	.25

CANADIAN RATES

Daily and Sunday	$10.00	$5.00	$2.50	$1.00
Daily only	7.00	3.50	1.75	.60
Sunday only	5.00	2.50	1.25	.50

FOREIGN RATES

Daily and Sunday	$24.00	$12.00	$6.00	$2.00
Daily only	18.00	9.00	4.50	1.50
Sunday only	7.00	3.50	1.75	.60

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

GUARANTEE

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape. No quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

The Associated Press is exclusively entitled to the use for republication of all news dispatches credited to it or not otherwise credited in this paper and also the local news of spontaneous origin published herein.

Nerve

Nothing calamitous had yet come to pass. That was why many things were not more swiftly done, and why a great deal of precious time could be plausibly wasted. If the Germans were committing barbarities upon our hearthstones instead of torpedoing our transports, we should not be taking the time to cross-examine the Secretary of War on the conduct of his job.

We shall pull it all out; we shall make up the time we have lost; we shall yet deliver the world, if that task be really reserved for us—all provided we do not lose control of our nerves.

The Administration must not suffer criticism to touch its nerves. It is bound to be criticised, for that is the immemorial way of the very democracy it believes in.

Every one engaged in the conduct of the war must expect to be criticised and perhaps to be sacrificed. That happens even in Germany.

The test of men is how they take it. Some take it weakly, in a personal manner, and invite a losing feud with the multitude. They are destroyed. Strong men take it objectively, in the impersonal manner.

The rules are immutable. It is like the game of hearts. The way to win is willingly to take what is honestly coming to you. One who tries to take less will lose.

More of Mr. Baker

The evidence obtained yesterday by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs by its cross-examination of Mr. Baker is of no intrinsic value. It comes to nothing at all. Nobody knows yet on what the Secretary of War based that estimate of the number of troops we could send to France this year which Senator Hitchcock has called wildly preposterous. It is very doubtful if the Secretary himself knows. He now admits the probability that he spoke without particulars.

What he does know well is how his own mind works. This was revealed in a singular statement here reproduced verbatim, but with a certain typographical arrangement, as follows:

I want to make a suggestion if
I may. The misfortune for
Me, if
I may call it such, in
My first statement to the committee,
lay in the fact that
I attempted to give opinions of the
broad general situation as
I saw it, when the information lay in
details that ought to have been gotten from the experts in direct charge or in statistics giving specific facts.
I was attempting a general survey. It
was a misfortune for
Me to do that.
I think it better to give the committee
specific statements.

Several things from this appear.

Most men think concretely of objects. When they say transports they think of a ship with bow and stern, a funnel for smoke and a deck to walk on; when they say troops they think of men in uniforms.

It is apparent that when Mr. Baker speaks of transports and troops he thinks abstractly of principles and situations.

That is why he cannot be held to anything. He did not say, for example, that a certain great number of troops could be sent to France in 1918. He said that number would be "available," and that the prospect of transporting them "was not unpromising."

It is apparent, in short, that Mr. Baker sees things intellectually, without edges. He is an intellectual in the job of a doer. His "misfortune" lies there, and not, as he said, in the fact that at first he "attempted to give opinions of the broad general situation."

Mr. Baker is a very remarkable person, with a mind of unusual refinement. He would make, perhaps, a great Attorney General or Secretary of State.

Also he is a great egoist, and continues to believe that investigations are personal. People are much less interested in Mr. Baker than he perhaps will ever know. They are interested in the conduct of the war—CONCRETELY.

The Decision at St. Louis

The Tribune believes that it would be a vital mistake to name as chairman of the Republican National Committee any man who cannot, and whose election does not tend to, cement all elements of the party. For the first time in its history the party has suffered two successive and notable defeats. This would be a sorry time to name any man whose selection would revive factional differences.

But more than this, the Republican party will be looked to this year to lead the country out of the morass of confusion worse confounded into which it has this winter been plunged. It would be a grievous mistake to name any man whose high Americanism might be questioned, or who did not strongly and loyally favor our entry into the war. This nation has now no divided feeling; the party cannot afford to name as its national chairman any man whose sentiments as to the war, and our allies, might be questioned in any way.

Honor for Labor

In a statement issued yesterday the head of the Emergency Fleet Corporation, which is the shipbuilding arm of the Shipping Board, repeated what Chairman Hurley said in this city last week:

> "The Shipping Board has the necessary yards, the materials and the money. All that is lacking is the spirit in the nation that will send a quarter of a million American mechanics into the yards to give the best and most efficient work. The yards are to-day only working one eight-hour shift, six days a week. If we are to get ahead of the submarine we must run three shifts per day, fifty-two weeks in the year."

General Manager Piez added that at the present time only one-third of the workers are American born and that "to the extent of 65 per cent we are forced to depend upon foreign-born labor." Why? We believe it is because neither the American-born mechanic, nor our manufacturers, nor the press, nor the Administration has yet deeply felt and broadly realized that this nation is at war, that its high repute is at stake and that America cannot make good its promises to its allies and cannot make the contribution to civilization which it has promised itself until it is organized for the job.

We have taken nearly a million and a half picked men from the farms and the factories at a time when the industries of the country were pitched at full speed. No wonder there is a shortage of labor for the ships if other industries cannot be drawn upon and are competing for labor against the shipyards themselves. We do not know how many men could be temporarily released from camp drill to serve in the shipyards. Out of nearly a million and a half it would seem as if there might be 100,000 or 200,000 at least. If this can be done it should be done quickly. But if American soldiers are to go into the shipyards in uniform, the men who work beside them should have an equally honorable distinction and equally feel that they are doing their share as Americans to help win the war.

We repeat our belief that the swiftest way to get the needed men is promptly to enlist a volunteer army of shipbuilders who shall be the industrial arm of the United States army at home.

An Opportunity for Governor Edge

Governor Walter E. Edge of New Jersey has in his hands the appointment of a successor to Senator Hughes for the term ending in March next year. We have spoken of the nation's deep need, in the present crisis, of men of commanding ability and character in Congress. There is one man in New Jersey of national reputation and of peculiar experience. He was the one man originally chosen by President Wilson for his Cabinet from that northern and eastern quarter of the country which contains more than two-thirds of the nation's population and more than three-quarters of its vast industrial activities. This man would have an especial calling, in the United States Senate, just at this time. He sat for three years at President Wilson's side as Secretary of War. No man living, unless it be Elihu Root, has a more intimate knowledge of the workings, the needs, the possibilities of that department than he. And we know that he has courage, energy and decision.

We refer to the Hon. Lindley Miller Garrison.

If Governor Edge had the appointment of four Senators he could hardly find four men who could at this juncture render a greater service to the nation than this ex-Secretary of War. No man could represent the State of New Jersey with more distinction. It would be a fine example to the party and to the nation, and would stamp Governor Edge as himself a man of Senatorial worth and weight, if he were to disregard all party considerations and appoint Mr. Garrison for the year that remains of Senator Hughes's term.

To Hate or Not to Hate

We can all give our approval to the order issued to the Four-Minute Men forbidding a campaign of hate—a methodical fanning of hatred against Germans and the German idea. This is America, where people form their own opinions and emotions. "We hate as one," said Lissauer's Hymn of Hate, and that was good German system, organization, propaganda. Here we work out our national salvation on a different plan. The individual rules. Tell him the facts and let him react as he wills. So runs the American idea.

Therefore, as a corollary to our first proposition, we suggest the truth that a propaganda of love for Germany and the Germans is equally unwanted. Germany will earn what she gets. To argue that we must not hate because hatred will delay peace or interfere with the beating of 75's into ploughshares when the war is over is to argue for exactly the sort of official, manufactured, governmental conscience that made the German people acclaim the rape of Belgium and the sinking of the Lusitania.

What we suggest is that the American people be left alone to hate or not to hate exactly as their individual consciences and hearts decide. Hate is a destructive, a terrible thing to arouse. But there are times when it is a sound instinct of self-preservation—as sound as the instinct to fight. Just whom we shall hate (if we are impelled to hate at all), whether only the Kaiser, or only the Junkers, or the whole German nation, is equally a matter for individual thrashing out. The only criterion we can insist upon is that we shall know the facts and that we shall be sincere. We should be very sure that it is the truth by which our hearts are stirred. Once we are sure of our facts, we should ask only to feel as honest, self-respecting human beings, neither trailing humbly in the wake of an Emperor nor pretending to be holier than God made us.

The Perverted Lee Again

It seems worth while to emphasize exactly what Warren G. Lee, at the head of the Brotherhood of Trainmen, meant when he said before the Railway Wage Commission at Washington that engines were being left to freeze up in order to discredit governmental management.

Mr. Lee's charge meant that the engineers and firemen, members of two allied unions, were taking orders from Wall Street to put their engines out of business—traitorously scuttling the ship—at a time when the whole nation and perhaps their own families were suffering from a lack of coal and millions were out of steady employment for the same reason.

We should like to know what the loyal engineers and firemen of this nation think of this abominable charge.

Shall the Famine Grow Worse?

"The Globe" of last evening quotes a prominent coal operator as saying:

> "Unless the fuel administration at Washington takes its hands from the throats of the mine operators the country this spring faces a shortage in bituminous coal which will be more disastrous to industry than anything we have so far experienced."

Meanwhile the present famine threatens to grow more acute. And still the Administration at Washington will do nothing that promises permanent or even extensive relief; that is, the increase of production and, what is far more important, the mining of real coal and not a mixture of coal and dirt.

We have in a time of high prices and steadily rising prices, of high wages and steadily increasing wages, relatively cheap coal. It is fantastic. There is only one way to stimulate production and that is to put the price high enough to bring out the coal and to discourage needless consumption.

We wish we could bring home to the public how small an amount of coal—and especially of soft coal—is used for domestic heating. More than one-quarter goes to the railroads, more than one-third goes to the large factories, about 15 per cent goes in the making of coke. Not more than one ton in ten is used for house heating. The direct charge to home consumers from an increased price for coal would be very small. It is the reckless use of coal—for needless transportation, for prodigal street lighting and house lighting, for the running of needless industries and for the making of luxuries—which has in large part produced the present famine. The famine, it should be clearly understood, is not due to a decreased production of coal, but to heavily increased demand.

There was plenty of coal last summer. The more foresighted of consumers laid in considerable supplies. And paid the price. The present situation is simply the result of trying to legislate cheap coal and high production. A lowered price for coal means a needless increase in consumption and inevitable cessation of the steadily increasing production.

We shall have no material improvement so long as doctrinaires and troublemakers remain in control.

Your Part

Anybody who wishes to flunk his part, to fail in that small share of the business of war-making which is the most that a majority of the stay-at-homes can do, will have no difficulty in finding a hundred excellent excuses. "Mr. Garfield never should have been appointed; the whole coal situation is hopelessly bungled; therefore I will not pay any attention to fuel orders." "Mr. Hoover let the American Sugar Company make a lot of money; why should I obey the food regulations?" Some such complaints and excuses are heard on the lips of soft-minded Americans wherever you turn. They are the exception, the rare exception. But their attitude is familiar enough to earn a word of comment.

The point we wish to make is that if the soldiers of France and England, or the peoples of France and England, had paid any heed to the blunders of their leaders they would never have fought the magnificent and successful battle they have. It is precisely because the men and women of both nations did their utmost as individuals, regardless of official stupidity, that civilization has been preserved and we Americans have now our chance to end the peril of the Hun for all time. On the Allied side, in every democratic nation at war, it has been the history that the people pushed their leaders forward, that the people corrected their leaders' blunders with individual courage and devotion, that the people prevailed after their leaders had fallen to the rear.

That is our part to-day and throughout the war. No official blundering is the smallest excuse for individual slacking. Rather is it the reason for redoubling our individual efforts to lend that aid without which the war cannot be won.

Zionism Elucidated

(From The Jewish Daily News)

The New York Tribune has rendered a distinguished service to the Jews in general and the Zionists in particular by having undertaken to give its readers a series of articles on the vital question of Zionism. Zionism is now not only a Jewish question.

Where Price Fixing Worked

Australia Broke Food Combines Which Charged Exorbitant Rates

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The able presentment by Mr. Fraser in this morning's Tribune of the fallacy of arbitrary price fixing brings to mind the fact that the government of Western Australia has been successful in doing this very thing—successful because it was done in accordance with the unyielding law of supply and demand.

The latest figures at hand at the moment are those of 1913, but they illustrate the way to do it as distinguished from the way not to do it. In the years 1912-'13 Western Australia was in the hands of a meat combine. The government acquired a fleet of four vessels, sent them to meat raising districts, offered low freight rates to meat producers, and bought meat as needed, opening government meat shops in several cities. The meat was sold at a fair profit, at six cents a pound below the prices of the combine, and in short order all the combine's stores reduced their meat to the government prices—and the government went out of business until such time as another lesson should be needed.

Another Australian state has large government bakeries in which bread is made for the penal and charitable institutions of the state. In 1914 a combine of bakers made an exorbitant raise in the price of bread. The government bakeries were set to work night and day at their utmost capacity, and the government bread wagons traversed the state from end to end selling bread at a fair profit. The bakers' combine surrendered and accepted the government price, and the government withdrew its bread wagons and returned to its normal activities. The profits of these emergency enterprises are used in establishing free libraries and reading rooms.

What Australia can do the United States can do, if it has equal discernment. The law of supply and demand cannot be set aside by any decree by any official, no matter how exalted his position. There is but one way to fix prices so that they are fixed, and that is the Australian way—to supply the demand at a fair, living profit just as long as the need endures and no longer. The President already has the power to do this, but has he the wisdom? RICHARD FERRIS.

New York, Feb. 4, 1918.

Ships and the Housing Puzzle

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: It seems strange to a large number of people that the housing problem was not taken up at the time the contracts were given to build the ships, as it will take months now, what with the plans, contracts and erection of these buildings before they will be ready for the labor. In the meantime idle ship yards and, what is worse, no ships.

It seems to the writer that there is a quicker way of housing these men than waiting for the erection of these government buildings.

In most of the shipbuilding centres there are large numbers of second-rate hotels which are well adapted to taking care of these workmen, especially single men, and also there are hundreds of married men, both skilled and unskilled, who would be glad of the chance to work at these ship yards who have homes of their own, and would need no looking after as far as housing them is concerned. The single men could be billeted at these hotels, as they do the soldiers in France.

There are also hundreds of men living within ten miles of these shipbuilding plants, already housed, who could be carried in by train morning and returned at night. The government has the railroads with which to do it.

Would it not be a quicker way of getting the ships built?

Now as to the labor, in all large bodies of quickly assembled labor you will find union and non-union men in more or less equal proportions. This means trouble sooner or later. There should be a shipbuilding army and every man applying for work should be drafted into that army and be under army rules.

I think there would be no trouble in getting all the men the shipbuilders would need, as most of the men would be with their families, which makes more contented workmen.

If a young man between twenty-one and thirty-one is loyal enough to fight for his country in a foreign land, why should any man over thirty-one object to being drafted into a shipbuilding army under good pay and still have the privilege of living at home with his family and friends?

ALFRED HOPPER.

Highland, N. Y., Feb. 4, 1918.

Why Let Salesmen Travel?

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Remarks are being made in high quarters in regard to the curtailing of railway travel, and various suggestions have been hinted rather than actually made, such as the raising of railway rates considerably, or the forcible reduction of traffic by 50 per cent. I do not travel much on the railway, but on a recent trip I was impressed with the fact that there is much travel which is not in the public interest. In fact, the public would be better off if some of the travellers were not allowed to travel. I refer to the travel done by those whose business it is to sell goods. At a venture I would say that one-half the Pullman traffic is made up of this class. It also constitutes a very large proportion of the day coach traffic.

Now, most of this traffic is entirely unnecessary. Its object is simply that some particular manufacturer, or more likely some distributer, may sell more than a competitor. The travellers themselves, in a great many cases, do not represent producers, but are simply parasites, who, to make profit for themselves, enhance the cost of goods to the consumer. We would get all we need, and at a considerably smaller cost, if this class of travel were entirely suspended. Let the railroad management forbid the travelling of selling agents for any but manufacturing concerns, and let the manufacturing concerns be approached to cut down their travel to a minimum. Let all speculators be forbidden to travel. We shall save in money when we go to buy anything, and railway traffic will be reduced to reasonable proportions without interfering with legitimate business germane to the general good of the country.

ANTI PARASITE.

Lexington, Ky., Jan. 31, 1918.

What Prices Do Farmers Want?

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In your issue of this date I read an article by Mr. Samuel Frazer, of Genesee County, in which he claims or predicts that price fixing on farm produce by the government will bring on a famine in 1918. If he will answer my inquiry through your paper, of which I am a constant reader, I would be very grateful.

He says farmers cannot be controlled. If that is so I am very anxious that he make known to the people at as early a date as possible what prices farmers want for wheat, rye, corn, barley, oats, buckwheat, hay, and all their products, so that the people may use their greatest influence with our legislative bodies, and they in turn use their influence with the price fixing bodies at Washington, in order that our abused farmers may be used right and get a square deal.

E. M. PALEN.

Kingston, N. Y., Feb. 4, 1918.

A GERMAN VIEW OF THE ALLIED CONFERENCE

The Allies sit in oppressive silence—only the Empty Chair speaks.
—From *Ulk*, of Berlin

Holland's Difficult Course

Her Statesmen Defend Her Efforts to Steer Neutrality Route Past "Danger Zone"

The New York Tribune Foreign News Bureau

A debate in the lower house of the Dutch Parliament has brought out several interesting points in Dutch foreign policy. One relates to the part of Holland in peace negotiations and another to the mooted question of the sale of the Dutch West Indies to America. As reported in the "Gazette de Hollande," the debate began with a criticism by Mr. Nierstrasz, a free Liberal Deputy from Amsterdam, on the anxious care with which Holland's warships avoided the "danger zone" to prevent "incidents." He said that if the "danger zone" had been ignored the Dutch protests would have had more force, and wanted to know why the government had not got a free passage for coal from England.

Mr. van Hamel, a United Liberal Deputy from Amsterdam, declared that there was much misunderstanding of Dutch neutrality both at home and abroad. If it was simply a determination to keep the peace at all costs, then the reproaches hurled at Holland were justified. Holland had to pay heavily for her neutrality, and it was a mistaken policy to smash the country economically for the sake of keeping peace. Maintaining neutrality, he insisted, did not prevent a vigorous attitude, and he said that there was much misunderstanding of the Dutch policy in America, where Holland was regarded with disdain and contempt. Public opinion abroad would have an important effect on after the war commercial relations, and the speaker doubted whether the government had done all it should from this point of view. Dr. van Dyke, he said, was the best propagandist for Holland in America.

Jounkheer Loudon, the Foreign Minister, replying to the various criticisms, said that exports to Holland were prevented by America on account of her own needs and those of her allies, and could not be allowed before careful calculations had been made of the actual needs of the neutrals. The proposals under consideration were to allow Dutch ships to make voyages outside the "danger zone" provided a certain proportion of the vessels was used for the relief of Belgium and France in exchange for a supply of coal for Holland by the Allies. Meanwhile, until the details of this arrangement could be settled, an endeavor was being made to reach a provisional agreement by which all Dutch ships in American ports could make one voyage to India, South America or Holland, save the vessels reserved for the Belgium Relief Commission.

The Minister denied that the Dutch Commercial Mission in Washington had been given power to negotiate the sale of the Dutch West Indies to America in return for the release of Dutch ships from American ports.

In regard to the negotiations for peace, Jounkheer Loudon held that such work must be carried on behind the scenes. He could neither carry on active peace negotiations nor subsidize propaganda, he said. The government could only give its moral support to such endeavors. He expressed his sympathy with the work of the League to Enforce Peace, but held that it was not for a small state to attempt to obtain peace by compulsory measures. He was in favor of international arbitration, and intended to lay before the committee of the third peace conference the plans of the League to Enforce Peace and the question as to what should be done after the war. He had already received from the secretary of the league an unofficial outline of a peace project and was considering the question.

Mr. van Hamel had brought up the question of ships clearing from Delfzyl, and had stated that the German government refused to let ships leave that port unless they signed a five years' time charter in favor of Germany. Negotiations on this subject, Jounkheer Loudon said, were connected with the German supply of iron and steel and were still in progress.

In regard to Dutch warships being barred from the ocean by the closing of the North Sea, he said that Dutch warships certainly had a right to pass through the barred zone, but he thought it would be foolish to risk their loss by mines, instead of keeping them to what was at least supposed to be a safe channel. He had tried to get from Germany a safe conduct for ships bringing coal from England, such as had been given to Argentina for vessels carrying food to Europe, but the negotiations had not yet been successful.

Coming to Holland being cut off by England from cable communication on account of the transport of sand and gravel to Belgium by Germany, Jounkheer Loudon said that he was prepared to lay the question before the two governments for arbitration. The conception of the British government was that all transit of metals, sand and gravel was illegal, while Germany held that such transits must be allowed, and Holland took the stand that the admissibility of the transport depended on its character. England's only mistake was in adopting measures of reprisal. Holland, as a small neutral power, desired to uphold her rights, and England had no right to injure her on that head. The Dutch government was prepared at any time to agree to arbitration. They had no interest in the question, except to uphold their rights.

Rationing Needed

Card Systems Do Not Assure a Fair Distribution of Life's Necessities

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I want to make a suggestion, or to second one if the same one has been made before, for a machinery of rationing the necessaries of life while the war is on that will reflect a fair distribution. Our present rationing can hardly be called a system. And even the "card" systems of which I know in Europe serve only to limit the amount one individual may buy of a commodity and, as far as I know, do not insure anybody his fair share.

It would probably cost some money, but would be worth the cost, for the government to establish "rationing offices" in every community, to which people could apply for a rating upon the basis of which they could obtain supplies of "short" commodities, such as sugar, flour, butter, oil and coal.

The ordinary foods should obviously be supplied upon a per capita basis, except that young babies, children up to ten or twelve, and sick people should have certain foods in normal quantity regardless of per capita supply. Coal would necessarily be distributed so much to each household, with some modification for the number in the household. Next year's coal pinch might well be met by some rule that a bachelor with two or three servants, or a couple or trio of elders with servants, should have to accept a minimum as a practical measure of conservation.

The amount per capita, or pro rata, as the case might be, ought easily be determinable because by July the government will surely be in possession of information about the supply and consumption of commodities sufficient for the administrators to determine what share each individual or family is entitled to have.

The heads of households should be directed to apply, after making out a well designed report that gives the number, ages, relations and especially health conditions of his family, in order to obtain a permanent certificate of his allotment of each commodity, stated in a percentage or other relative form, so that the positive amount of each commodity which he is entitled to buy would be fixed relatively and vary, if necessary, under changing conditions of the supply.

With these certificates, showing at a glance the right of the individual or the head of a family to so much of any commodity, it would be a mere clerical matter for people to obtain, as they needed, government orders upon dealers for specific quantities of the goods, and if the government should desire to regulate both price and quantity it could sell these orders to consumers and make its own settlement with dealers, or it could make the price appear upon the face of the order.

Consumers, with such orders, should then be free to negotiate them with any dealer they choose, and dealers should be furnished at wholesale with new stocks only as they present these orders as evidences of legitimate and fair distribution.

Such a system, while it would cost something, could be so coördinated with the various administrative schemes as to make it economical for the public, which has to pay all the bills in the end. It would insure every household its share of every necessity. The card system does not insure anything, not even that persons do not obtain an unfair share. It would make it necessary for dealers to compete again for business.

It is very important that we insure fair distribution of coal and food, for the present farce of distribution to ultimate consumers, with its glaring inequalities, is causing distress and unnecessary expense among individuals and will without doubt affect the raising of future war loans.

In the New Jersey town in which I live some residents are obtaining all the coal they want; others, among persons who are ordinarily in comfortable circumstances, must eke along, buying coal by the bagful and paying a high price, notwithstanding the inconvenience of having to go and get it. Others are shutting up their houses because they cannot buy coal at all. The dealers are in an open agreement not to sell to each others' customers, but are violating it for special reasons. I know of the arrival, three weeks ago, of a full carload of coal for a private resident. One dealer seems unable to obtain anything like his pro rata share in the little coal available and has fallen down on agreements made last summer with residents who, with public spirit, made arrangements to take a minimum of coal, month by month, to help the general situation. I myself, unless I obtain coal this afternoon, will have to close the house in which I am living and send my family to the country at an expense which, I am afraid, will seriously cripple our resources. I have so far burned less than half the usual quota of coal. If the other residents of my town whose houses are closed up are in my fix it will be a serious matter to bring our town's next loan total up to the previous figures. ESSEX COUNTY.

Bloomfield, N. J., Jan. 30, 1918.

Are You a Patriot or a Profiteer?

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: You may be both and justly so, but you may determine just where you stand by use of the following:

First—Make a private list for your personal use of all the advantages you have gained by the present war; in this connection it may be said that, notwithstanding the high cost of living, wages have been such that during 1917 more money has been placed in the savings banks by the laboring men in this country than during any previous year, and that last Christmas more money was spent for luxuries than for many years.

Second—Make a similar list of all the voluntary personal sacrifices you have made for your country. In this connection you may add such efforts you have made to conserve bread meat and fuel for our allies and for our own soldiers in France, but do not lay too much stress on your purchases of Liberty bonds, which are largely an evidence of your prosperity during the past year, as they are a profitable investment of your savings.

New York, Feb. 4, 1918. T. A. HAY.

The Easy Road to Peace

Just Stop Fighting and Let Belgium Be Destroyed

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In a recent address before labor delegates Lloyd George uttered these remarkable words: "If any man standing in my place can find an honorable, equitable and just way out of this conflict without fighting it through, for heaven's sake let him tell me!"

In the light of this significant utterance, coming from no less a man than the Hon David Lloyd George, no one can now brand as traitor or pacifist any one who offers, in good faith, an intelligent peace proposal. Let the vindictive men who at this crucial time put petty party politics above love for their country, and who write and speak not so much perhaps for the sake of patriotism as for the sake of the first syllable in patriotism—let such men rant and rage over the war. Sober-minded men have now left these demagogues behind them. Lloyd George desires an honorable peace. The better-minded men among the Allies are with him.

I do not stand in the place of Lloyd George, but I can tell him an honorable way out of this desolating conflict.

In the first place, we must realize that so far as the fighting goes the war is about over. All the nations are nearly exhausted, and though the war might perhaps be kept up, no real good would result from its continuation.

In the second place, it should be realized that the one thing above all others that delays the coming of peace is this senseless striving after victory—this foolish endeavor, always more characteristic of base than of honorable men and nations, to see "who is boss." There was great wisdom in President Wilson's words, "Peace without victory." Not that it is possible for nations to go to war without one side or the other being victorious; but the point that should be emphasized is that it cannot be determined at once who is the victor. This is the work of future historians. Just as it takes a long time to determine the true value of a great writer's work, and in most cases a proper estimate of his work is not arrived at until long after the writer's death, so it takes many years to determine who has been the real victor in any war. In the long run, very often to win is to lose and to lose is to win. Forces and causes interact, fresh points of view are arrived at, and new world purposes, values and relationships are discovered, so that a hundred years after a war is ended it may be found either that the nominal victor and vanquished are the real victor and vanquished, or that victor and vanquished have exchanged places.

For the present it is enough to know that the actual fighting is about over, and it only remains to settle outstanding difficulties and to refix the boundaries of conquered territories. This work will be done in the council chamber. The Allies have acquired territory by conquest, and likewise has Germany. The readjustments of territorial boundary lines must be worked out around the peace table. Each side must make concessions and, laying aside all rancor and hatred, approach the work in the spirit of good will and fair dealing. Germany must get off some of her high horses, but at the same time it must be realized that Germany needs a little more land in order to support her growing population. Surely England, which owns more of the earth's surface than any other nation, will not grudge Germany a few extra square miles.

As for Belgium, that thorn in the flesh of the world, much diplomacy will be required to determine her status. Belgium's sins in the Congo do not entitle her to a very great deal of sympathy, but of course her derelictions in the Congo cannot be considered in the council chamber.

It may help a little toward solving the Belgian difficulty to take into consideration the fact that Belgium was created to serve as a buffer state against the possible encroachments, not of Germany, but of France. France has always had an eye on her.

To solve the difficulties involved in the violation of Belgium's neutrality will be a hard nut to crack, but it may help some toward this end if we consider (1) that the principle of perpetual neutrality is not firmly established in international law, dating only from 1815, and (2) that, after all, the history of all wars shows that the principles of international law are more operative in times of peace than in times of war. In war these principles have always been honored more in the breach than in the observance. Finally, Deut. ii, 26-35, should also guide the peace councillors in their deliberations over the status of Belgium. CHARLES HOOPER.

Seattle, Wash., Jan. 28, 1918.

The Snows of Present Years

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In your editorial last Sunday you spoke of "Snows of Yesteryears" and our remarkable January. You should have mentioned that our grandfathers, and even the celebrated oldest inhabitant, could not boast of a colder day than that of December 30 last.

The four severest winters within a hundred years were those of 1741-'42, 1764-'65, 1779-'80 and 1820-'21. On January 25, 1821, the mercury dropped to 7 degrees below zero. This was one degree colder than in January, 1765 (date not given), when it was 6 degrees below zero, the coldest ever known in this city. December 30, 1917, when the thermometer registered 13 below zero, was, as far as any records found show, the coldest in the annals of the city.

There are accounts of the harbor being closed by the ice and teams of horses passing from the Battery to Staten Island on the same, but this was caused by large cakes of ice becoming jammed at the Narrows. On several occasions both the East and Hudson rivers have been crossed over on the ice at the lower end of the city.

One of the most remarkable changes in temperature occurred in Albany in February, 1789 (date not given). At noon the thermometer was 18 above; at 6:30 the following morning it was 24 degrees below zero.

ABRAM WAKEMAN.

New York, Feb. 5, 1918.

The Dante League Ambulance

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: At the last meeting of the Dante League of America I agreed to be treasurer for the Italian Ambulance Fund, to be raised by the members of the league, which will pass through the American Poets' Ambulance, Italy's office, direct to Milan.

I would be obliged for the valuable publicity of your paper, as the ambulance fund for the American Dante League ceased when it became known that two members had sent checks covering the amount for one ambulance.

Some members had already sent contributions, and the money thus donated would be merged in the general fund, unless the rest of the members helped to raise the balance of the $1,500 needed.

The first Dante League ambulance (which is No. 28), which was donated by Dr. and Mrs. J. H. Lancashire, is already in active service. Italy needs immediate help for its wounded.

We trust all members and friends of the Dante League of America will respond to this appeal. All contributions can be sent direct to me. WILLIAM SARTAIN,

130 West Fifty-seventh St., New York, Feb 6 1918.